

Appl. No. 10/605,651  
Amdt. dated September 05, 2005  
Reply to Office action of June 06, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are listed above only as a convenience to the Examiner. No amendments are made.

5

**1. Rejection of claims 1-10 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda (US 6,211,649) in view of Chiu (US Pub. No. 2002/0195993):**

*Claims 1 and 13:*

10

The applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to make the combination of Matsuda and Chiu.

The motivation suggested by the Examiner, namely "...to provide means for the easy/convenient of charging and transmitting data in the same adaptor," is a result that Matsuda's device already accomplishes. Matsuda's data and charge adaptor of Fig.1 quite clearly already provides a suitable "means for the easy/convenient of charging and transmitting data in the same adaptor." Furthermore, Matsuda's disclosure does not provide any motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the combination (MPEP 2143.01). For example, Matsuda does not suggest any motivation for having separate second and third ports, as claimed, instead of the provided phone connector 3. Therefore, when considered as a whole, Matsuda does not suggest the desirability of making the combination.

25 In addition, Chiu only teaches power connections for mobile phones. The applicant recognizes that a port/line can be used for different purposes, however, as for motivation, the applicant asserts that Chiu lacks any mention of data connections. That is, Chiu does not provide motivation for modifying a connector to carry data and then applying these

Appl. No. 10/605,651  
Amdt. dated September 05, 2005  
Reply to Office action of June 06, 2005

connectors to Matsuda. Furthermore, the proposed modification of Chiu, namely replacing one of the power connectors with a data connector, may indeed render Chiu unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, namely, providing a multitude of different power connectors to choose from. Therefore, when considered as a whole, Chiu does not suggest  
5 the desirability of making the combination.

In summary, since neither Matsuda nor Chiu suggest the desirability of making the combination, the applicant argues that the rejection should be withdrawn.

10 *Claims 6, 7, and 13 (mechanical and electrical removability):*

The applicant believes that Chiu does not teach or suggest removable ports, lines, or cables. The Examiner's reference to Fig.2 of Chiu does not seem to show this claimed feature. While Chiu's power connectors 37, 38, and 39 are indeed mechanically and  
15 electrically removably connectable from mobile phones, these connectors are not mechanically and electrically removably connected to a housing as claimed.

Rather, Chiu suggests away from removable cables by showing a *plurality* of fixed cables. That is, Chiu's solution to the problem of differing power ports, while still  
20 complete in its own right, is significantly different from the invention's solution. Therefore, not only does Chiu not teach or suggest this aspect of the invention, Chiu is incompatible with it.

Since Chiu does not teach or suggest ports, lines, or cables removable from a  
25 comparable housing, the combination does not meet all limitations of claims 6, 7, 13, which is a requirement for an obviousness rejection. The limitations not met are as follows:

Appl. No. 10/605,651  
Amdt. dated September 05, 2005  
Reply to Office action of June 06, 2005

In claim 6,

5           the second port, second data line, and second cable are mechanically  
and electrically removably connected to the housing by a second  
cable connector

In claim 7,

10           the third port, third power line, and third cable are mechanically and  
electrically removably connected to the housing by a third cable  
connector

In claim 13,

15           a second cable having a plug removably attached to the second cable  
socket

            a third cable having a plug removably attached to the third cable  
socket

20

Thus, since the combination does not meet all limitations of the claims, the applicant  
argues that this rejection should be withdrawn.

25           Reconsideration of claims 1-10 and 13-17 is respectfully requested in view of the  
above arguments. Claims 2-10 and 14-17 are dependent and should be allowed if claims 1  
and 13 are allowed.

**2. Rejection of claims 11-12 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

Appl. No. 10/605,651  
Amdt. dated September 05, 2005  
Reply to Office action of June 06, 2005

over Matsuda in view of Chiu and further in view of Liao (US 6,604,951):

Reconsideration of claims 11-12 and 18-19 is respectfully requested in view of the arguments made in section 1 above. Claims 11-12 and 18-19 are dependent and should be  
5 allowed if claims 1 and 13 are allowed.

Sincerely yours,

10



Date: September 05, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

15 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)

20